

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Christian Journal of Opinion

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY

MAY 21 1960

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION
& EDUCATION

The Cold Comfort of a "Mystic Unity"

Since our recent editorial on the South African situation ("The Churches and the South African Tragedy," May 2), the distinguished English author, Rebecca West, has given her report in the *London Sunday Times* after a two-month visit to the Union of South Africa. She discloses that she was prepared to view the situation with some tolerance because she knew the Bantu tribes to be rather backward and expected that race relations would be difficult. But she was shocked by what she saw, "a system existing to enforce folly."

The hated pass system is administered in such a way that it becomes a pure instrument of caprice, heaping indignities on the black population. She describes the emergency measures taken by the Government—forbidding both white and Negro meetings, the arrest of over a thousand Negro leaders, including a former contributor to this journal, Prof. Z. K. Matthews, the distinguished moderate leader known to many of us in America—as the death of the republic and the beginning of a "police state."

In the same mail that brought us Miss West's indictment we received from the Committee on Race Relations of the Federal Council of the Dutch Reformed Churches of South Africa an amazing and depressing document on "The Problem of Race Relations." There is not a word in it about the problem of justice and no expression of an uneasy conscience about a situation that has exercised the conscience and prompted the apprehensions of the whole world.

After a lengthy historical survey of the assiduous missionary labors of the church among the Bantus (defined as "the heathen"), the commission defines its "doctrinal approach." The gist of the approach is: the church "can by no means associate itself with the general cry in the world today for equality and unity."

This general cry does not take into account that there cannot be unity without Christ in a sinful world. The story of the Tower of Babel is cited several times to prove that the division of tongues is the consequence of sin. Hence, it is futile to attempt such a unity "because true unity can only be achieved in Christ." Does this mean unity between the races within the church? Not at all. White and Negro churches must remain. "Unity already exists in Christ," and this unity through the Holy Spirit is more real than any contrived unity in a particular church.

The Dutch Reformed Church reminds us that it is Protestant, not Catholic, and therefore is under no illusions about the perfection of the historic church. The commission declares, "The Dutch Reformed Church accepts the unity of the human race, which is not annulled by its diversity." Even the Pauline dictum that "God has made of one blood all nations of the world" is subordinated to the idea that the only true unity is "in Christ." Through the free grace of God he assembles his church out of all nations. This assembly of believers or communion of saints forms an indissoluble unity as "the mystic body of Christ."

Vol. XX, No. 8, May 16, 1960 \$5.00 per year; 25 cents a copy

We have never witnessed such flagrant misuse of religious and theological terms to hide rather than illumine moral dilemmas, nor the use of religion as an escape for an uneasy conscience, not even in the Nazi days of the "German Christians."

The whole document is pervaded by such an air of unreality that we wonder whether it will prompt laughter and disdain or bitterness from the Negro population. The latter is more likely. Fortunately a minority in the South African church is stirring in protest, but their protest is probably too late. Events are overtaking the church as they have overtaken the Government. The church in league with the Government is obviously the "salt which has lost its savor."

What cold comfort it must be to the Negro majority to realize that the white minority, which daily oppresses them and violates their human dignity by every method of chicane, feels itself in a "mystic unity" with them as long as nothing is done to implement that unity in either church or state. Religious self-deception cannot go further. This is the final limit.

R. N.

"BLASPHEMY" AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM

THE TEST of a democracy lies not only in the freedom of voters to vote but also in the freedom of writers to write and teachers to teach.

In early April, Mr. Merrill Rodin, an instructor in a humanities course at the New York State University College on Long Island, assigned a poem about the Crucifixion by Lawrence Ferlinghetti. The poem, No. 5 in a volume called *A Coney Island of the Mind*, is a meditation on the death of Christ set forth in so-called "beat" language.

*You're hot
 they tell him
And they cool him
They stretch him on the Tree to cool. . . .*

A blast immediately came from the region's Congressman, Steven Derounian. He called the poem "cheap, tawdry, and insolent beatnik . . . deriding the most solemn and sacred event in Christian belief." He said, "This is the kind of

class assignment I would expect in a university in the Kremlin. . . ." He called it blasphemous and demanded an investigation by Governor Rockefeller, the State Board of Regents, the state education commissioner, and the college dean. When his demands were seconded by the local chapter of the Catholic War Veterans, Mr. Rodin, Dean Leonard K. Olsen and the faculty of the college found themselves in the center of a storm.

The issue at stake, of course, is not whether the poem under discussion is blasphemous. That question could not be decided unambiguously. Any work of literature requires interpretation. A poem cannot be blasphemous until it is interpreted to be so. It is because the act of interpretation is unavoidable in reading literature that academic freedom is indispensable to its teaching. A student cannot be taught properly to read a poem unless he be taught also to make for himself the act of interpretation. Thus free discussion is essential to the pedagogic process, and the teaching of entirely "safe" or "inoffensive" writings would destroy that process.

The real issue in the Long Island controversy, therefore, is the preservation of academic freedom. If freedom is necessary for pedagogic reasons, it is also necessary for the health of a pluralistic democratic society. If a branch of the New York State educational system should allow itself to be forced to withdraw this or that literature from its classrooms because of pressure from any group outside its faculty, it would be derelict in its educational duties to the people of the state.

Education in a pluralistic society demands the freedom to consider and discuss ideas that may be offensive to some elements within the society. Dean Olsen apparently understands this. He wrote to Rep. Derounian: "It is inevitable and desirable that many students will encounter positions with which they cannot agree, but it is the obligation of a university to inquire into and to examine impartially and broadly rather than protect students from views other than their own."

The Christian conscience is in agreement with such a statement. Even if the poem in question were blasphemous, which is doubtful, the Christian devotion to freedom would impel us to declare that the truth does not require putting blasphemy in chains.

T. F. D.

Christianity and Crisis, Vol. XX, No. 8, May 16, 1960. Published bi-weekly for 24 consecutive issues, beginning the third Monday in September, by Christianity and Crisis, Inc., 537 West 121st St., New York 27, N.Y. Subscription price: Canada and U.S.A., \$5.00; Great Britain, £1 2s; to foreign nationals subscribing from countries not in the dollar zone, \$3.00. Second class postage paid in New York, N.Y.

The National Council of Churches: An Evaluation

PETER DAY

A MOMENTOUS EVENT took place on November 29, 1950 when twenty-nine Christian communions and eight interdenominational agencies came together to form the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America (NCC).

Even at the outset, the structure and the programs of the Council were so complex and far-reaching as to defy detailed analysis or evaluation. Today, as the NCC approaches its tenth anniversary, it has thirty-three communions as members; another forty participate in at least one of its seventy program units. The original budget of some \$6,000,000 has been doubled. The staff has increased about fifty per cent to 684, of whom about 200 are classified as executives.

All this adds up to a great many people spending a great deal of money, to quote the message of the constituting convention in 1950, "in pursuit of whatsoever things are true, honest, just, pure, lovely, and of good report." And in relationship to the World Council of Churches, the NCC serves, as the 1950 message said, as "the national unit in a system of unified Christian enterprise which circles the inhabited earth."

Two great achievements serve as landmarks of the National Council's first decade. The first is the publication of the Revised Standard Version of the Bible (RSV). In all its varied uses the RSV has proved itself to be one of the great versions of the Bible. It constitutes a reopening of the Scriptures to the common people comparable to the Vulgate and the King James Version. The RSV would, of course, have seen the light of day even if the National Council had not come into being, since it was a contribution of the International Council of Religious Education to the common effort.

The second achievement of the NCC may rightly be viewed as its own. This is the recently constructed Interchurch Center on Riverside Drive in New York City, providing an architectural expression and an engineering implementation of cooperative Christianity. This imposing building houses most of the Council's program units as well as some denominational boards and various other religious and charitable organizations.

Mr. Day, an Episcopal layman, is Editor of *The Living Church*. He is a member of the General Board of the National Council of Churches.

National Council units have carried out many diverse programs during the decade. Church World Service has fed the hungry, clothed the naked and sheltered the homeless; the Divisions of Home and Foreign Missions have helped the constituent churches carry forward their missionary programs; the Divisions of Christian Education, Evangelism, Christian Life and Work, the Central Departments of United Church Women and United Church Men, the Broadcasting and Film Commission, the Bureau of Research and Survey, and the Washington Office have all performed varied services designed to serve the churches and the public. Of these, only United Church Men can be considered a failure—but then, so are the men's programs in most of the constituent churches.

The end of the NCC's first decade finds the Broadcasting and Film Commission (BFC) in the midst of a significant philosophical struggle. Not content to serve primarily as a service unit for denominational programs, the BFC believes it can prove that only a non-sectarian approach to Christianity gets across to a mass audience. But since denominational funds are dedicated to the brand names and specific doctrinal interests of the member churches, the churches will not buy what the BFC wants to sell.

Though short on funds, the BFC is not without resources because it has a powerful influence on the allocation of network sustaining time to the churches. When virtue is arrayed against virtue and both sides have power, the struggle is likely to be a long one. Though in no sense a failure today, the cooperative effort of the churches in radio-TV will probably not be as successful as it ought to be until the BFC becomes more denominational and the denominations become more ecumenical in outlook.

The Problems of Prophecy

The unique contribution of the NCC to the American Christian scene is its bigness. But bigness, as Haldane has pointed out in his famous essay, "On Being the Right Size," is a limitation. A horse is too big to fly. An elephant is too big to jump. A brontosaurus is too big to survive.

In the area of prophecy, the bigness of the NCC has already taken its toll. The Federal Council of

Churches, the NCC's predecessor, in its day (and at its best) could sound like Isaiah. The National Council sounds more like Ezekiel. Since its inception ten years ago, the NCC has issued twenty "pronouncements." Beginning with a lifeless theological generalization, they go on to confess the sins of lay members of the constituent churches, dividing delicately between the "some" and the "many" and the "all." They then wind up with a bold proposal for solving the problems of the year before last. These forty-nine pages of hierarchical wisdom lead one to the despairing cry, "How could so many mean so little by so much?"

Like the prophecies of Ezekiel, however, the pronouncements of the NCC say more than their literary style leads one to expect. If the view of God that emerges is that of a cosmic football coach firing up the team to new heights of endeavor, still there is enough point to them to infuriate a substantial section of the laity.

For—responsibly, carefully, soberly, cautiously, even platitudinously—the NCC, through its General Board and General Assembly, has steadily reaffirmed economic, social and international policies that place the interests of private enterprise and individual nations in subordination to the freedom, well-being and safety of mankind. Even the Sunday school theology of "Onward Christian Soldiers" and "Rise up, O Men of God" is strong enough meat, it seems, to cause choking among vestrymen and church trustees.

Rebellion of the Laity

It cannot be said that NCC pronouncements are very far in advance of the social policies of the U.S. Congress and the major political parties. But they seem to be miles ahead of the general body of Christian laymen. On the question of right-to-work laws, for example, an executive of United Church Men (UCM) was undoubtedly right in reporting that eleven out of twelve laymen he knew were in favor of laws prohibiting labor agreements that make union membership a condition of employment. Yet in recent referenda, the public as a whole has agreed with the NCC in opposing such laws. Even if the UCM executive was exaggerating, the fact still remains that the Christian laity of the country occupies a position well to the right of the general population on many political issues. In opposing right-to-work laws, the NCC is ungratefully defending the interests of non-churchgoers against churchmen!

It is not surprising that the NCC's consistent tendency to oppose economic and social policies that benefit the influential church member has led to discontent and occasionally to rebellion among the laity. The charge of Communist infiltration in the churches has served as the answer of the conservative laity to the charge of self-seeking materialism repeatedly leveled by the NCC against them.

During the hysteria of the McCarthy period, it seemed not at all impossible that the NCC would earn a prophet's reward for exercising its right to prophesy. The charge has recently been resurrected in an Air Force training manual, with little real effect upon public opinion but possibly with an ominous effect upon the economic base of the NCC and its affiliated state and local councils.

A decade ago, laymen were more inclined to take for granted the desirability of a comprehensive national organization of churches. Today their religion is much more denominationally oriented than it was. Proposals to withdraw from interdenominational ties are coming up more frequently in area councils of the constituent communions, and every now and then withdrawal of funds or membership is voted.

After all, every time the NCC says that the Federal Government should undertake one or another program out of tax funds, it is saying that force or the threat of force should be used to take goods from person "A" and give them to person "B." If person "A" happens to be one of those upon whose support the whole complex program of the NCC depends, the question of the functions appropriate to bigness becomes acute. Sharp social criticism and prophetic vision have seldom been characteristic of big institutions that expected to have a long life. And, although the NCC has tried to use moderation, deliberateness and responsibility in its pronouncements—has tried to jump instead of fly—the second decade may yet prove that it is an elephant and ought not even try to jump.

Plainly, one of the greatest issues confronting the National Council in the next decade is its relationship to the laity. Although laymen are supposed to be repelled by theology, it might still be true that more theological depth would give greater relevance and acceptance to the NCC's social pronouncements. It often seems to be too easily assumed that the demonic forces at play in our society can be conquered by well-chosen increases in the federal budget or by earnest exhor-

tations to right living. In this fallen world, every solution leads to new problems, and the layman may occasionally be right in asserting that the new problems will be as bad as the old ones.

Amos had a simple solution for the problems of Israel, but after offering it all he had to do was to go home to Judea and tend his flocks and fig trees. Hosea lived with the problem, and so must the laity.

Yet the fact remains that the interests of the laity are not necessarily the interests of the general body of the American people. All the churches—at least those that are represented in the NCC—seem to have been preaching a gospel that makes better sense to the middle-high income brackets than to the lower brackets. The sons and daughters of the Christian revolution have gone through a metamorphosis comparable to that of the sons and daughters of the American revolution.

The Taboo-Breaker

Yet there are times when the National Council's contribution to public issues is of crucial importance. Such an occasion was the 1958 Fifth World Order Study Conference. Though sponsored by the NCC, it did not speak officially for the Council. However, since the NCC has suffered blame for that conference's demand for greater flexibility and humility in U.S. foreign policy, it is entitled to some of the credit too.

Until the Conference met and dared to voice its concern with the rigidity and belligerence of the nation's posture in international affairs, there was almost a national taboo on the word—and the idea—of peace. An editorialist in the religious or the secular press, a teacher in the classroom, an ordinary person in conversation had to demonstrate his militant anti-communism before proposing the slightest step toward moderating international tensions.

A substantial part of the earthly ministry of Jesus Christ was his taboo-breaking. He healed on the Sabbath, let his disciples eat without ceremonial washings, and said that the things that defiled a man came from inside him, not outside. In choosing a Samaritan as hero, Jesus broke another taboo.

The Conference broke the national taboo against peace-making. And, in spite of the public outcry against its message, it succeeded. Although many other factors played a part in bringing about the thaw in the Cold War, this contribution was im-

portant. When men are being too clean, the church must dare to be unclean. When they are being too righteous, the church must be unrighteous. Through this Conference, the forces of cooperative Christianity accepted this dangerous responsibility at the right moment in history.

Diversity in Unity

The NCC's contributions to the internal life of the Christian community have been many, not only in program but also in more fundamental matters. Of great interest has been the part played by the Division of Christian Education in helping the Orthodox churches develop Sunday schools and Sunday school materials to maintain their spiritual witness against the pressure of the secularized American pattern of living. In 1950 four Orthodox bodies were represented. There are now seven, including the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese under the forward-looking leadership of Archbishop Iakovos.

In addition, the ancient Church of Armenia is represented through its American diocese. The Polish National Catholic Church, another new member communion, is of special interest because it represents the Western Catholic theological and liturgical tradition followed by Rome. At least one of the NCC presidents during the decade—Dr. Eugene Carson Blake—asserted from time to time that the Roman communion itself would be eligible for membership.

The impact of these other Christian traditions has by no means obliterated the NCC's characteristically Protestant flavor. The NCC now officially describes itself as "an agency through which Protestant and Orthodox churches in the United States express their common faith in Jesus Christ as Divine Lord and Saviour, and cooperate to focus the light of that faith on all phases of American life." But the generous inclusion of "Orthodox" in this description is an expedient for maintaining a clear line of demarcation between Christians who belong to the NCC and those who belong to the Roman Catholic Church.

Many Protestant churches do not belong to the National Council, including some big ones; and some churches of Catholic type do belong. The right word to describe the NCC is "Christian"; if it must be modified, an appropriate term would be "cooperating Christian." "Protestant and Orthodox" says both too much and too little, reflecting

the old dream of a "united voice of American Protestantism." Unlike the Federal Council of Churches, the National Council has attracted to its leadership a substantial proportion of the theological conservatives of the member churches, as well as whole churches that represent a conservative theological position. Here, as in the realm of social prophecy, it seems that the price of bigness is that a larger proportion of the NCC's time is spent on keeping things from happening and less time is spent on making things happen.

Its Ecclesiological Significance

An Anglican is particularly impressed, not to say dismayed, by the organizational complexity and power-concentration that seems to spring so naturally from the Protestant ethos. American Roman Catholicism has no over-all organization comparable to the NCC. Individual enterprise serves ecclesiastical needs, independent monastic orders run schools and colleges, diocesan bishops do what they please, and local priests have a pretty free hand as long as they stay out of trouble. In Anglicanism, most of the church's laws are designed to protect the liberties of bishop, clergy and laity from each other. One is led to wonder whether Protestant fears of Catholicism are based on what Protestants, with their organizing ability and resolution-passing propensities, would do with a hierarchical form of government if they had one!

The question of the ecclesiological significance of the National Council and of state and local councils has become much discussed. Although the NCC stoutly insists it is not a church, there are those who say it manifests some of the characteristics of a church rather more clearly than its constituent denominations. Such discussion demands a definition of a church—a Congregationalist's definition of a church might include such a body as the NCC although an Anglican's would not.

Yet the National Council does have ecclesiological significance, even for an Anglican. Its very existence raises ecclesiological questions—pointed questions about why we cannot receive communion with those who work with us for the glory of God and the expression of his will. The courteous but firm insistence of the Orthodox that there is and can be only one Church of Christ is an insight that belongs to all of us. The solution is not to try to convince the Orthodox that there are many churches of Christ, but rather to persuade them to include us in it. If there is only one Church, what part does the National Council play in its life?

The purpose of the NCC, as given in its preamble, is to *manifest* oneness. To identify the Church with any institution in this world is to incur all the liabilities and limitations to which institutions are subject. Yet to fail to make such an identification is to incur other liabilities and limitations.

We are one in Christ. This is an eschatological affirmation. As such, it has only a limited application to the present order of things. When he comes in judgment, he will implement our oneness in him and the problem of Christian unity will be summarily solved. In the years or days remaining to the present order of things, the manifestation of our oneness must be based not only on this eschatological affirmation but upon the operation of his Holy Spirit. The Spirit bears his witness both through individuals and through institutions or social entities—primarily, perhaps, through the latter.

The body possessed by the Spirit is the body to which St. Paul refers when he speaks of the Church as the body of Christ. The body is a phenomenon of this world. Its difference from this world is the fact that the Holy Spirit dwells in it. We must learn to declare our oneness in the Holy Spirit as a consequence and an anticipation of our oneness in Christ.

Long-Range Planning

The newest great development in the life of the National Council of Churches is known as "long-range depth planning."

"Long-range planning" opens many exciting vistas of coordination between the NCC and the churches, and among the churches themselves. By sheer weight of preparation and detail, it is almost certain to bring the churches closer together, to help them objectify their several goals, and to sharpen their methods of approach toward those goals.

Institutional self-understanding and success are abundantly in prospect. New handholds of personal significance for clergy, secretaries and inner-circle laymen will attract ever-increasing supplies of leadership. But the soul of the church is on trial in an area where simplicity, improvisation, and random response may be the only relevant techniques—in the inner city where captive populations are waiting to see a great light.

The intractable nature of the universe is brilliantly illuminated by the contradictions inherent in this concern. "Long-range planning" is a peculi-

arly upper-middle-class activity. The Gospel that won the lower classes of the Roman empire and welded them into a spiritual unity with discontented aristocrats was: "Forget your long-range planning—the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

This, too, is grist for the mill of the long-range planner. The dedicated staff of the NCC must carry our hopes for the preservation of the qualities of immediacy, simplicity and urgency—the "I and thou"—in the encounter of the Church, through the National Council of Churches, with the men and women of America.

CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Fitch and Mr. Miller on Ethics

TO THE EDITORS: Since Alexander Miller practices better than he preaches, I am not unduly alarmed by his espousal of the ethics of the blithe (not the Holy) spirit ("Unprincipled Living: the Ethics of Obligation," March 21). After all, it is not his living, it is only his thinking that is unprincipled.

(1) *On relativism.* Of course the ethical decision is relative to the context. Who disputes that? But it is also related and relative to an objective moral order.

(2) *On moral law.* To get started philosophically one might try a combination of Brightman and Dewey on creative growth. To get started religiously one might take the biblical values of justice, righteousness, love and liberty, and work on from there. Anyway, just because relativity physics has superseded Newtonian mechanics, it does not follow that you can go walking out the third floor window as though the law of gravitation were inoperative.

(3) *On method.*

(a) If a compound of "faith and facts" is all we need for the Christian decision, then Barth's ethics of caprice with regard to Nazism and communism is an adequate and coherent social ethics.

(b) Is it indeed the case that habits are easier to change than rules (and hence preferable)? In my book and in that of Aristotle (whose "provisional morphology of man" Miller accepts), habits are what animals have; rules and principles are what human beings have in addition to habits.

(4) *On man.*

(a) Mr. Miller asserts twice that you can find out what is good for man simply by asking him. Really, now, when man is a sinner? For instance, would you ask Big Daddy in the *Hot Cat*?

(b) Mr. Miller celebrates the *koinonia* by which God enmeshes man "in a profound mutuality of obligation that is for pure love's sake." But just how, without a few principles, do you tell the difference between that *koinonia* and the *koinonia* of Rousseau's *Social Contract* or of Hobbes' *Leviathan*?

(c) So the normal basis of joint social action is "a combination of a prudential calculation reinforced and corrected by an innate impulse of justice and compassion." This I can find in Adam Smith's *Theory Of Moral Sentiments*; but why and how drag in Reinhold Niebuhr?

My only regret is that Mr. Miller did not write his treatise before I wrote mine. I could then have acknowledged his as part of the evidence for the evanescence of ethics. Yet I must respect Mr. Miller's scruple concerning the business he is peddling, i.e., "if the word *ethics* is appropriate at all"! Indeed, if this represents the best of contemporary Protestant speculation on morals, then ethics is not obsolescent. It is obsolete.

ROBERT E. FITCH
Berkeley, Calif.

I am at a disadvantage in discussion with Robert Fitch because, after some years of invigorating association, my instinct is to expect him to be right even when he is at his most outrageous. But his reply still leaves me restive. Let me take his points in order and then reiterate a question:

(1) We agree that "the ethical decision is relative to the context": he goes on to insist that it is also "relative to an objective moral order." I should substitute "to a basic loyalty," in the Christian case to the Christ.

(2) As I understand the exegetes, "the biblical values of righteousness, etc." have less to do with "creative growth" as in Brightman and Dewey than with precisely that "right relation" of men to God that I am proposing as the objective base for decisions about conduct.

(3) (a) If "faith and facts" are *not* all we need (I myself find it salutary and exacting enough to try to do them justice) will Mr. Fitch be more precise about what we do need?—and if he says "principles" again I shall scream.

(b) Certainly, according to Aristotle, habits are for animals, rational principles are for rational men. But the Bible is not Aristotelian: man in the Bible may be more or less rational, but he is, distinctively, "covenant" man or "new man in Christ." In this context I should probably have said *mores* rather than habits, for *mores* animals *don't* have.

(4) (a) Certainly man's judgment about what is good for man is a vulnerable judgment, since man is a sinner. But Brightman, Dewey and Aristotle are sinners too, and their judgment does not become less vulnerable because they call it rational.

(b) Surely the New Testament *koinonia* is to be distinguished from Hobbes or Rousseau very simply by the fact that Christ is at its heart?

(c) I admitted that my formulation on this

CORRECTION

John H. Gilchrist, who wrote the letter "Ambiguities Within Atomic Matter" (Correspondence, May 2, p. 61) was incorrectly identified as Robert H. Gilchrist.

point was provisional, and I did not associate Reinhold Niebuhr with it.

"If the word *ethics* is appropriate at all . . .": Mr. Fitch knows that the implied question is legitimate and not a sell-out. He and I are both concerned to elucidate what it means to serve men for love of God; but as we try to do this, it is legitimate to enquire whether the biblical faith can be subsumed under any standard notion of ethics. After all, the Bible says what it has to say without using the word at all.

Let me ask once again: since my friend Fitch and I are busy at the same tasks in obedience to the same Lord, why does he insist on forcing "principles" on me? If my case is dire without them, will he, of his charity, tell me what they are?

ALEXANDER MILLER
Stanford, Calif.

The Editors Express Their Thanks

to those readers who received sample copies of *C & C* and passed them on to their friends. The response to your efforts was encouraging, indicating that the friends who share your concerns and interests are the first to appreciate the journal.

In the near future we will send three sample copies to the rest of our readers, with the hope that you will want to help us reach new people during our Twentieth Anniversary year.

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBY
PHILOSOPHY-REL-EDU-PER
5201 WOODWARD AVE
DETROIT 2 MICH
1714 11-60R A

NEWS AND NOTES

American Committee Aids Africans

Early in May, the Anglican Archbishop of Cape Town, Joost de Blank, acknowledged the receipt of a \$2,000 contribution to Africans in need of legal aid and family welfare. The contribution was a portion of \$10,000 collected recently by the South Africa Emergency Appeal of the Africa Defense and Aid Fund which was established by the American Committee on Africa.

The money was collected since the killings by police at Sharpeville in March and the subsequent mass arrests, shootings and beatings that have affected thousands of South African natives. More money has been requested recently by liberal South African leaders still out of jail.

The remaining \$8,000 was sent through various sources, which a fund spokesman recently described as being increasingly difficult to find.

Almost \$300,000 was spent on legal and welfare costs of those accused by the Government of treason, i.e. publicly opposing *apartheid*, in recent years. Of that amount, \$50,000 was raised in America by the South Africa Defense Fund, the predecessor of the present fund.

Those wishing either to make contributions or to learn further details of the present campaign may write to: South Africa Emergency Appeal, American Committee on Africa, 801 Second Ave., New York 17, N.Y.

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Christian Journal of Opinion
537 WEST 121 ST. • NEW YORK 27 • N.Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR AND JOHN C. BENNETT, *Chairmen*
WAYNE H. COWAN, *Managing Editor*
M. SEARLE BATES WALDO BEACH AMOS WILDER
ROBERT MCAFEE BROWN F. ERNEST JOHNSON
ROGER L. SHINN HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
RICHARD T. BAKER J. OSCAR LEE
TOM F. DRIVER ROBERT W. LYNN
KENNETH W. THOMPSON WILLIAM LEE MILLER

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HENRY SMITH LEIPER JOHN A. MACKAY
FRANCIS P. MILLER M. M. THOMAS
ALEXANDER MILLER J. B. DUROSELLE
JOHN BAILLIE WILLIAM F. MAY SIDNEY LANIER
HERBERT BUTTERFIELD PAUL H. NITZE

CONTENTS

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES:
AN EVALUATION

PETER DAY